

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 15, and 16 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 11, and 15 have been amended. Claims 17 and 18 have been cancelled.

The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of the pending rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In item 3 on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9-12, and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,969 B1, issued to Weinberg (hereinafter referred to as "Weinberg") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,993,657, issued to Renner (hereinafter referred to as "Renner"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that in the present invention, as indicated by the language of currently amended independent claims 1, 9, 11, and 15, candidate data for the data input area is generated. The candidate data is a piece of text with a length greater than the maximum length acquired from the first tag, and wherein *the piece of text describes in itself the fact that the length of the text is greater than the maximum length*.

The Examiner alleges that, "it is old and well known in the art to comment about the computer code and to indicate so by comments via wording with special symbols." See Office Action, page 15.

Applicants respectfully submit that the candidate data produced by the claimed program is visible to the test operator, that is, the user of the program, whereas the comments of a computer code are not visible to the actual user of the code. Such a difference results in a particular effect. That is, according to the present invention, in contrast to the references, the candidate data describes in itself the fact that the length of the text is greater than the maximum length of the data input area to be tested, and therefore, the test operator can, "*select and enter the candidate data to the data input area on the structured document with an intent to see how the server computer reacts to violation of the formal requirement for the data input area*." [emphasis added]. Such an effect cannot be obtained by simply inserting mere comments in a document.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 11, and 15 are patentable over the references, as neither Weinberg nor Renner, alone or in

combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of the present invention, as indicated by the claim language.

As Dantressangle, Gough, Murren, and Brenner add nothing of relevance to the combination of Weinberg and Renner, the claims are patentable over all of the cited combinations of references. As dependent claims 2-8 and 16 depend from independent claim 1 and dependent claims 10 and 12 depend from independent claims 9 and 11, respectively, the dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after the response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/4/07

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501